

From: [Young, Howard S.](#)
To: [Zhen, Davis](#)
Cc: [Sheldrake, Sean](#); [Scott Coffey](#); [John Kern](#); [Silvertooth, Jason R.](#); [Trump, Julee M.](#)
Subject: FW: Surface Sediment Recovery Depths - Response to EPA 4.20.18 deliberative
Date: Monday, April 23, 2018 8:10:35 AM

Davis,

For you use, here is a response to the data submittal on 4/20/2018 and a request for additional data to assess the hard sediment power grab refusal issue.

Howard

Ken,

EPA appreciates the information provided on 4/20/2018; however, the information is not sufficient for assessing the problem of power grab refusal prior to reaching the 30 cm target depth due to hard sediment. In addition, the sample data only extends to 4/10/2018 but EPA must have up to date information through 4/20/2018 on all sediment grab samples. Please provide the following information for all samples collected through 4/22/2018:

- All attempted grabs for the project through 4/22/2018
- Grab sample ID
- Coordinates of all attempted grabs
- Grab in the Primary 25-foot radius, contingency 25 to 50-foot radius, Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 location
- Penetration depth
- Reason for not achieving 20 to 30 cm (e.g. rock, wood, cobble in jaws, washout, man-made structure in the sample area)
- Sediment type
- Whether or not the grab was input to the composite (when the new sampling protocol is implemented we will need tracking information on what grabs go into the "thin" and "thick" composite samples)

EPA requires this information to assess the issue of equipment-based bias resulting from frequent need to move to contingency grab locations when the power grab experiences refusal in hard sediment at <20 cm. EPA requires this information through 4/20/2018 right away and updates on a weekly basis.

The alternative surface sediment sampling plan proposed in the 4/20/2018 does not meet the requirements of what was requested by EPA and is not acceptable. For situations where power grab refusal is encountered in hard sediment at depths <20 cm, EPA's requested plan must be implemented until an alternative plan is approved by EPA.

Thank you,

Davis

From: Sheldrake, Sean <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>

Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2018 7:33 AM

To: Young, Howard S. <younghs@cdmsmith.com>

Cc: Zhen, Davis <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>; Silvertooth, Jason R. <silvertoothjr@cdmsmith.com>; Trump, Julee M. <trumpjm@cdmsmith.com>; Coffey, Scott <CoffeySE@cdmsmith.com>; John Kern <kernstat@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Surface Sediment Recovery Depths - Response to EPA 4.20.18 deliberative
Agreed Howard. Could you reformat this message such that Davis can send to Ken?

Thanks
S

Sean Sheldrake, RPM
Unit Diving Officer
206.225.6528
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 21, 2018, at 10:43 AM, Young, Howard S. <younghs@cdmsmith.com> wrote:

Sean and Davis,

The information that is submitted here is insufficient to assess the issue of possible equipment related bias due to rejecting grab locations that didn't reach 20 -30 cm penetration because of hard sediment. It only shows what samples were accepted at less than the 20 cm penetration. From our limited oversight observations it looks like 15 to 20% of the total grabs had to be repeated due to <20 cm penetration depth in hard sediment. What we need to obtain from the Pre-RD group is a table with the following information:

- All attempted grabs for the project
- Grab sample ID
- Coordinates of all attempted grabs
- Grab in the Primary 25-foot radius, contingency 25 to 50-foot radius, Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 location
- Penetration depth
- Reason for not achieving 20 to 30 cm (e.g. rock, wood, cobble in jaws, washout, man-made structure in the sample area)
- Sediment type
- Whether or not the grab was input to the composite (when the new sampling protocol is implemented we will need tracking information on what grabs go into the "thin" and "thick" composite samples)

I also see that what data they did provide only goes through 4/10/2018, with no information on the last 10 sampling days, which is problematic for EPA's real-time oversight decisions.

I suggest that we put in another request for this information asap in addition to the vessel GPS position check data. Then require submittal of this information on frequent basis so we understand the frequency of the hard sediment refusal and need to move to contingency grabs.

Howard S. Young, LG | CDM Smith

14432 SE Eastgate Way, Suite 100 | Bellevue, WA 98007-6493

T: 425.519.8300 | Direct 425.519.8351 | Cell 206.491.4663 | younghs@cdmsmith.com
| www.cdmsmith.com

From: Coffey, Scott

Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2018 8:18 AM

To: Zhen, Davis <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>; Sheldrake, Sean <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>;
Young, Howard S. <younghs@cdmsmith.com>; John Kern <kernstat@gmail.com>

Cc: Silvertooth, Jason R. <silvertoothjr@cdmsmith.com>; Trump, Julee M. <trumpjm@cdmsmith.com>

Subject: FW: Surface Sediment Recovery Depths - Response to EPA 4.20.18

My initial thoughts:

Finally good to receive this information from them. 10% of samples where this occurs seems pretty low, but they're not done yet. The take home lesson for them that I don't think they understand is that they need to provide information like this to us sooner (especially when we ask for it) so we can review the complete field information and avoid getting into threatening Shut Down situations to get them to produce this info. I'm sure they have been collecting this info in this format all along. According to my records, we asked them for this information on Wednesday April 11th and it took them until April 20th to provide it – too long.

I don't see any difference in their new approach (presented in their complicated flow chart) with what they've been doing all along, except that now (if approved) they will be allowed to keep and analyze a composite sample that has grabs <20cm.

Even at 10%, the EPA approach provides a comparison and data for statistical evaluation of the potential bias between samples at a primary location that have grabs less than 20cm with a sample that meets the criteria. Granted, this is an additional step, but one that has arisen due to some locations (despite the tools' robustness) it is not able to penetrate in hard sediment. My understanding from John's emails is that the additional sample collection in these areas will allow us to evaluate if an equipment bias is introduced in these areas. The Pre-RD Group doesn't seem to understand this objective yet.

That's my initial thoughts.

Scott

From: Zhen, Davis <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 6:48 PM

To: Sheldrake, Sean <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>; Coffey, Scott

<CoffeySE@cdmsmith.com>; Young, Howard S. <younghs@cdmsmith.com>; Trump, Julee M. <trumpjm@cdmsmith.com>

Subject: Fwd: Surface Sediment Recovery Depths - Response to EPA 4.20.18
FYI

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone, please excuse typos

Davis Zhen, Manager

Environmental Cleanup Unit 2

Office of Environmental Cleanup

[1200 Sixth Avenue Suite 900](#)

M/S ECL – 122, [Seattle, WA 98101](#)

Tel: [\(206\) 553-7660](tel:(206)553-7660)

Cell: [\(206\) 437-5826](tel:(206)437-5826)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Anne Fitzpatrick <AFitzpatrick@Geosyntec.com>

Date: April 20, 2018 at 6:06:11 PM PDT

To: "Zhen, Davis" <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>, "Tyrrell, Ken" <ken.tyrrell@aecom.com>

Subject: Surface Sediment Recovery Depths - Response to EPA 4.20.18

Dear Davis,

On behalf of Pre-RD Project Coordinator Ken Tyrell (who is on a plane) I am sending this email on behalf of the technical team regarding surface sediment sampling and recovery depths. The attached materials are in response to the EPA's correspondence dated April 12, 2018, and our discussions earlier today by phone. Thanks for sending the diagram outlining Bowl 1 and Bowl 2 protocols for grab sampling; we have not had time to digest this graphic. However, we've asked the field crew to prioritize stations over the weekend where > 20 cm recovery is easily expected. Four attachments (based on earlier discussions today) include:

- Draft Decision Flow Chart for modifying the FSP sampling protocol based on difficult sample recovery conditions
- Summary table of the 13 PDI locations not obtaining 20 cm recovery depth, notes on # of attempts made, and depth of recovery
- Summary of LWG RI depth recoveries for surface samples with recovery
- Figure presenting the 13 PDI locations (< 20 cm depth) compared to RI/FS Existing Debris within the Study Area

Discussion

1. The Decision Flow Chart (and Narrative on page 2) describes a step-by-step procedure for the Field Team to efficiently collect composite samples, especially in areas with refusal (jaws don't close, or no sediment in the grab) and difficult/poor recovery (less than 10 cm) after multiple grabs.
 - a. Clarifies a target depth goal of >20 cm at the primary location
 - b. Clarifies a minimum acceptable average depth of 10 cm or greater
 - c. We are balancing the desire to achieve >20 cm sample depths with the time/effort expended collecting multiple grabs and moving from Primary to Alternate 1 to Alternate 2 locations (max about 10 attempts per grid location). We are trying to achieve the goal of obtaining samples from the primary locations.
2. To date, we have accepted 13 locations with substation samples below the target 20 cm (~10% of the data collected so far); most of

these depths were between 10 and 19 cm (See Surface Sampling Recovery Summary table). Several attempts were made at each station to obtain better samples and the field notes documented difficult conditions including refusal debris, rocks, logs, and riprap in many of the grabs, or hardpan/minimal sediment. One sample location, PDI-SG-055-BL1, is only a 2-point composite because of refusal. We believe these samples are representative of site conditions and are acceptable for use. We are working on a more detailed table showing sample recoveries – will send next week.

3. A query of existing RI surface sediment grab data show that 35% of the surface sediment samples collected for the RI were < 30 cm, but 0% were less than 10 cm (see attached histogram graphs and scatterplots).
 - a. In addition, we looked at the 2012 Draft RI/FS Debris Figure (Figure 2.1-5) – a lot of debris was noted in the vicinity of these PDI locations.
 - b. RI grab samples in close proximity to our PDI samples typically recovered sediment between 20 and 30 cm, however these were typically located in deeper water compared to our samples, and not 3-point composites. We are uncertain if these RI locations were original locations or moved due to site conditions/refusal. Many of the difficult conditions we encountered are in the nearshore areas. Changing the field equipment or methods will not resolve the issues/conditions that we are encountering; a power grab is already being used with 1000 ft/lbs of closing force, and field crews are actively changing the weights to improve the penetration. *A couple of photos attached below.*
4. A figure showing the 13 PDI locations that accepted a substation sample below the target 20 cm and the RI debris map. The stations are well distributed through the site, and mostly in nearshore areas where debris was noted during the RI.

Based on the information provided above, we are (i) proceeding to run all 13 samples for chemical testing and (ii) implementing the Decision Flow Chart for field staff. Although the collection depths were below the 20cm target depth described in the FS we believe these are acceptable for use. The average recovery depth is > 10 cm, and is consistent with Section 1.2 of the FSP that allows for collection of samples with lesser depth under certain conditions such as those encountered. Excerpted below:

Surface sediment will be collected from a target depth of 0- to 30-centimeter depths, consistent with the RI (Integral 2004). A minimum depth of 10 centimeters will be considered acceptable (especially if sampling on a sediment

cap).

We can set up a conference call with your technical team early next week to discuss/walk through our analysis and path forward.

Have a great weekend.

Regards,

Anne